

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/761,488	01/21/2004	Young-Ho Kim	8836-225 (IB12190-US)	4065	
22150	7590 05/25/2005		EXAMINER		
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD			TRAN, MAI HUONG C		
	UKY KOAD 7, NY 11797		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2818		
			DATE MAILED: 05/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					—— — H,			
		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/761,48	8	KIM ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
<u>-</u>		Mai-Huong	<u> </u>	2818				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	n appears on the	cover sheet with the	orrespondence add	iress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati s period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory is tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no eye on. , a reply within the statu period will apply and wi statute, cause the appl	ent, however, may a reply be story minimum of thirty (30) o Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro ication to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely, om the mailing date of this con NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)  ズ	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	02 May 2005.		٠				
2a)□	·	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims			•				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of The oath or declaration is objected to by the specific to the specific to the specific transfer of trans	s/are: a)⊠ acce to the drawing(s) b correction is require	e held in abeyance. Sed if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CF	R 1.121(d).			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Beet the attached detailed Office action for	iments have bee iments have bee e priority docume Bureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applic ents have been rece e 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National \$	Stage			
2) Notice 3) Infor	ot(s) Ce of References Cited (PTO-892) Ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) Mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/8 CERNO(S)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		I-152)			

### DETAILED ACTION

#### Election/Restriction

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-3) drawn to a semiconductor device is acknowledged. Accordingly, claims 4-14 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed error in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Applicant has the right to file a divisional application covering the subject matter of the non-elected claims.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that see the election paper. This is not found persuasive because the fields of search for method' and device claims are NOT coextensive and the determinations of patentability of method and device claims are different, that is process limitations and device limitations are given weight differently in determining the patentablitity of the claimed inventions. Also, the strategies for doing text searching of the device claims and method claims are different. Thus, separate searches are required.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

# Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Background of the invention in view of Cappelletti et al. (US 6,576,950).

Regarding to claim 1, Background of the Invention discloses an electrically erasable programmable read only memory (EEPROM) cell, comprising an isolation layer formed at a semiconductor substrate 10 to define an active region; a source region 40, a buried N+ region 16 and a drain region 42 formed at the active region and spaced apart from each other; a cell depletion region 38 formed at the active region between the buried N+ region 16 and the drain region 42, the buried N+ region 16 being in contact with the cell depletion region 38; a first channel region between the source region 40 and the buried N+ region 16; a second channel region between the cell depletion region 38 and the drain region 42; a memory gate 34 formed over the first channel region and the buried N+ region 16; a selection gate 36 formed over the second channel region; and

Art Unit: 2818

a tunnel oxide layer 22 formed on the buried N+ region 16 (Specification, pages 1-4, and fig. 4).

Background of the Invention doesn't disclose the distances between the edges of the tunnel oxide layer and the buried N+ region are equidistant. However, Cappelletti teaches the distances between the edges of the tunnel oxide layer and the buried N+ region are equidistant (fig. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the distances between the edges of the tunnel oxide layer and the buried N+ region are equidistant, as taught by Cappelletti in order to guarantee the functionality and reliability of the memory device, and secondly to keep unchanged as far as possible the performance of the advanced-logic device on the technological platform (col. 1, lines 21-25).

Regarding to claim 2, Background of the Invention discloses the EEPROM cell wherein the memory gate 34 comprises a floating gate 24a; an inter-gate dielectric layer 30a on the floating gate; and a control gate electrode 32a on the inter-gate dielectric layer (Specification, pages 1-4, and fig. 4).

Regarding to claim 3, Background of the Invention discloses the EEPROM cell wherein the selection gate 36 comprises a lower selection gate 24b; an inter-gate dielectric layer 30b on the lower selection gate; and an upper selection gate 32b on the Art Unit: 2818

inter-gate dielectric layer, the upper selection gate being electrically connected to the lower selection gate (Specification, pages 1-4, and fig. 4).

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication on earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mai-Huong Tran, (571) 272-1796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR, Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C/M